

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/888,668	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAO, MENG	
	<b>Examiner</b> Peter K. Huntsinger	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Peter K. Huntsinger.

 (2) Michael J. Nickerson
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 15 June 2007
**Time:** 4 PM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*USC 102 rejection of claim 6*

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

*Stanich '813*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 AUNG S. MOE  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the attorney that the arguments in relation to the rejections of claims 1-5 and 7-15 were persuasive and the rejections would be dropped. The examiner explained that the arguments in relation to claim 6 were not persuasive and that if the limitation of claims 1 and 9 was added to claim 6, the claim would be allowable. The attorney agreed to the amendment on 6/18/07. .